

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-14, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102; and claims 6, 9, 15-16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In response, claims 1, 8-10, 19 and 20 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome or are improper for the reasons set forth below.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Patent Office essentially asserts that claims 1-20 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Patent Office states that the specification as filed does not properly provide support for relation data forming means or the step of forming relation data.

Applicants believe that the specification provides sufficient support for relation data forming means or the step of forming relation data such that one skilled in the art would know that the applicants had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing the application. As illustrated in Figure 2, for example, data from the supplemental broadcast includes a video part (symbolic image) S-1 which forms a symbolic label for a supplemental program #1, a video part S-2 which forms a symbolic label for a supplemental program #2, a video part S-3 which forms a symbolic label for a supplemental program #3, control data, access restrict flag, local ground-wave channel information, a video part (supplemental program image) V-1 and audio part (supplemental program sound) A-1 of the supplemental program #1, and other suitable data. See, specification, page 19, line 16 to page 20, line 6. As further illustrative of the claimed invention, the symbolic label of the supplemental program can be displayed together with main programs of multiple ground-wave broadcast channels. For example, a symbolic label which is displayed together with a main program of a ground-wave channel A can also be displayed together with a main program of another ground-wave channel B. In essence, the relation data forming means or the step of forming relation data is the process of linking the symbolic label and supplemental information with the corresponding television broadcast program as fully described above. In view of same, one skilled in the art would clearly understand that claims 1-20 of the present invention are sufficiently described in the specification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-14, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 (“*Alexander*”).

Of the pending claims at issue, claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 19 and 20 are independent claims. Independent claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus which produces information which supplements television broadcast programs produced from a first broadcast station. The apparatus comprises a symbolic label forming means which forms symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information, a relation data forming means which forms relation data that shows which program the information supplements, and a transmission means which transmits the information, symbolic labels and relation data from a second broadcast station. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and thus, as a matter of law, incorporate each of the features of claim 1.

Independent claim 8 recites an information processing method which produces information which supplements television broadcast programs. The method comprises the steps of forming symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information produced from a second broadcast station, forming relation data that shows which program the information supplements, and transmitting the information, symbolic labels and relation data from a second broadcast station.

Independent claim 9 recites a medium which operates on a computer to run an operation program which implements the information processing for producing information which supplements television broadcast programs produced from a first broadcast station. The operation program comprises the operational steps of forming symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information, forming relation data that shows which program the information supplements, and transmitting the information, symbolic labels and relation data from a second broadcast station.

Independent claim 10 recites an information processing apparatus which receives and processes information which supplements television broadcast programs produced from a first broadcast station, symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information, and relation data that shows which program the information supplements. The apparatus comprises a reception means which receives the information, symbolic labels and the relation data from a second

broadcast station, a display control means which operates on a display device to display the information, the symbolic labels and the relation data, and an output control means which operates in response to the operation of selection of a symbolic label to release data corresponding to the selected symbolic label. Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and thus, as a matter of law, incorporate each of the features of claim 10.

Independent claim 19 recites an information processing method which receives and processes information that supplements television broadcast programs produced from a first broadcast station, symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information, and relation data that shows which program the information supplements. The method comprises the steps of receiving the information, symbolic labels and the relation data from a second broadcast station, controlling a display device to display the information, the symbolic labels, and the relation data, and controlling, in response to the operation of selection of a symbolic label, the release of data corresponding to the selected symbolic label.

Independent claim 20 recites a medium which operates on a computer to run an operation program for receiving and possessing information which supplements television broadcast programs produced from a first broadcast station, symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information, and relation data that shows which program the information supplements. The operation program comprises the operational steps of receiving the information, symbolic labels and the relation data from a second broadcast station, controlling a display device to display the information, the symbolic labels and the relation data, and controlling, in response to the operation of selection of a symbolic label, the release of data of corresponding to the selected symbolic label.

As previously discussed, independent claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 19 and 20 have been amended. As amended, these claims further recite, in part, an information processing apparatus or method that produces information which supplements television broadcast programs produced from a first broadcast station. The apparatus or method includes forming symbolic labels indicative of the content of the information produced from a second broadcast station. The second broadcast station is distinct from the first broadcast station. For instance, a communication satellite (CS) broadcast station produces supplemental broadcast programs for the main broadcast program of the ground-wave station and broadcasts the supplemental programs by using a CS digital

broadcast wave where the supplemental programs are broadcast simultaneously with their corresponding main broadcast program as illustrated in the specification, for example, on pages 8-10.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Applicants believe that *Alexander* at least fails to disclose or suggest receiving a broadcast of supplemental information produced from a second broadcast station separate from the first broadcast station that produces the television broadcast programs. *Alexander* discloses an electronic programming guide (“EPG”) that provides improved viewer interaction capabilities with the EPG. See, *Alexander*, Abstract. The primary focus is on a computer system with a memory storage unit that downloads and stores information/advertising data about television programs and displays specific information in conjunction with corresponding programs. See, *Alexander*, column 8, lines 19-35. Rather than using a second broadcast station for transmitting supplemental information as required by the claimed invention, the EPG uses data from the internet or the viewer’s television connection (i.e. first broadcast station) to supplement current programs listings. *Id.* Thus, *Alexander* does not disclose, at least, receiving a broadcast of supplemental information produced from a second broadcast station separate from the first broadcast station that produces the television broadcast programs, nor does it teach or suggest same.

Based on at least these noted reasons, Applicants believe that *Alexander* is deficient with respect to the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Alexander* fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-14, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 6, 9, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over *Alexander*, and claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over *Alexander* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,708 (“*Remillard*”). Applicants believe that these rejections are improper.

Applicants believe that the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited art. Based on at least the reasons discussed above, *Alexander* is deficient with respect to the claimed invention. *Alexander* fails to disclose or suggest receiving a broadcast of supplemental information produced from a second broadcast station separate from the first broadcast station

that produces the television broadcast programs. Therefore, *Alexander* on its own is clearly deficient with respect to the claimed invention.

Further, Applicants do not believe that the Patent Office can rely solely on the *Remillard* reference to remedy the deficiencies of *Alexander*. Indeed, the Patent Office merely relies on the *Remillard* reference for its purported teaching regarding printing data adapted for print out so as to allow the user to obtain a hard copy of the information presented on television and its purported teaching regarding receiving broadcast programs composed of data adapted for ordering commodities so as to allow the user to make purchases from home. See, Office Action, page 13-14. Nevertheless, *Remillard* also fails to provide receiving a broadcast of supplemental information produced from a second broadcast station separate from the first broadcast station that produces the television broadcast programs. Therefore, even if combinable, *Alexander* and *Remillard* fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention and thus fail to render the claimed invention obvious based on at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections with respect to claims 6, 9, 15-16, 18 and 20 be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4310

Dated: October 8, 2004